

27



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,326	12/21/2001	Gregory Roger Hamel	10541-282 V200-0117	3239
29074	7590	03/20/2006	EXAMINER	
VISTEON C/O BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			FLANDERS, ANDREW C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2644	

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/029,326	HAMEL, GREGORY ROGER	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Andrew C. Flanders	2644	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Andrew C. Flanders.

(3) Michael N. Spink.

(2) Andrew R. Graham.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 March 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 7 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Janik (U.S. 2002/0164973), Dwyer (U.S. 6,671,567).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the differences in the interpretation of the term personal computer bus. Applicant stated that he believed a shared pathway was required for the interconnections (i.e. the printed circuit board) in Janik to be considered a pc bus. Examiner disagreed, and maintained the position that a set of hardware lines (conductors) used for data transfer among the components of a computer system as defined by the Microsoft Computer Dictionary still applied in the Janik reference. The Examiner also submitted that while Janik is somewhat silent as to the type of interconnections: 1.) a shared bus could possibly be inferred as there are many typical PC components interconnected; 2.) Even if a point to point connection is assumed, these devices must communicate to each other through the Microprocessor and thus must be on a shared connection; and 3.) even if Janik does not disclose the type of bus as Applicant suggest (which the Examiner does not necessarily agree with) it would not provide a patentable distinction over Janik. Next claim 15 was discussed. Applicant did not believe that the single cable connection used in the rejection could be considered a network. Examiner disagreed and maintained the same position that a network can be defined as a group of computers connected together. Applicant then suggested amending the claims to make the portable device be connected to a LAN, with its own unique address and could serve (transfer files to) more than one PC on the network which appears to overcome the applied prior art but further search and or consideration will be required to verify this. We then discussed claim 7. Applicant suggested amending the claim to more clearly show what was intended as shown in Fig. 3. The limitations suggested involve claiming that the terminal is completely covered when the speaker is attached and not accessible until the speaker is removed, thereby exposing the terminal. No indication of allowable subject matter was given. Further search and/or consideration will be needed to determine allowability. .



**SINH TRAN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**